Research and New Technologies Workgroup Meeting Notes
May 26, 2009

Welcome and Introductions

Some individuals did not receive email notifications for the webinar today. Potential problems with the listserv will be looked into.

To register for upcoming webinars:
- Go to: www.hie.ca.gov
- Click on link:
  http://www.chhs.ca.gov/initiatives/HealthInfoEx/Pages/StakeholderWorkgroupParticipants.aspx
- Scroll down to bottom, link for webinar registration is available for workgroups

Stakeholder engagement process
- 4 weeks ago, started with a small stakeholder group
- Now have about 350 people involved
- 4 workgroups, about 80 people per workgroup

For the R&D Workgroup:
- Everyone is expected to sign up for one of three subcommittees.
- Will be 3 co-chairs
  - Ravi Nemana, CITRIS
  - Kathy Kim, San Francisco State University,
  - One more TBD

Communication tools:
1. Website (will transition to a new site in 4-5 weeks): www.hie.ca.gov
2. Send email to: hie@chhs.ca.gov
3. Listserv: TechRDWG@maillist.dhs.ca.gov
4. Regularly scheduled webinars, calls. Will be scheduled out through the end of the year
5. Wiki for documentation management and collaboration tool is now available

Presentation – Jonah Frohlich

http://www.chhs.ca.gov/initiatives/HealthInfoEx/Documents/RD-mtgslides-May26.pdf

- Background
  - HITECH supports the creation of "Centers for Health Care Information Enterprise Integration" through competitive grants administered by NIST/NSF to institutions of higher education (or consortia thereof, which may include non-profit entities and Federal labs)
  - $20 million in grants nationally (for entire 50 states)
  - The State's role is to facilitate/coordinate the formation of such center(s)

Vision
- The State's vision is that this process will help maximizes health IT integration, promote stakeholder collaboration, and optimizes the opportunity to receive federal funding

Workgroup Charter
- To create a strategic plan for a California-based research consortium, and to position and prepare California stakeholders to receive federal funding to launch and support the "Centers for Health Care Information Enterprise Integration"

Proposed Subcommittees
NOTE: per the discussion that ensued (see Discussion below), Subcommittees 1 and 2 will be combined. A new subcommittee will be formed to identify strengths that California possesses that will be assets in future research.
- ORIGINAL Subcommittee One – Research/Communication Technology Interface
  - Interface of communication technology to information systems
  - Voice recognition systems
  - Improving interoperability and connectivity
  - HIT security and integrity
- ORIGINAL Subcommittee Two – Research/Quality and Productivity
  - Measure impact of HIT on quality and productivity
  - Management of Health Information Exchange
  - Use of HIT to reduce medical errors
  - Maximizing HIT dependability
- ORIGINAL Subcommittee Three - Governance/Sustainability/ Dissemination Process
  - Define integration, interoperability, and meaningful use.
  - Governance
  - Process for fair share of work and funds
  - Create HIE education plan

Action Items
Subcommittees 1 and 2 will be combined. A new subcommittee (New Subcommittee 2) will be formed and will be tasked with inventorying California's research assets. The workgroup charter will be updated to reflect these changes.

Timeline:
- Current guidance - Federal money may be available October 1, 2009
- Phase 1 – Develop strategic plan
  - June 8-July 13 – Subcommittee meetings
  - Week of July 13 – Summit Meeting, present recommendations
  - July 31 – Submit final plan for comment
  - August 17 – Plan completed
- Phase 2 – Develop proposals for federal funding
- Phase 3 – Receive funding and launch

Discussion

Tom Philips: Expressing interest in a particular subcommittee that fits with current work. Will send a note.

Kathy Kim: Unsure of the goal. Are we coming up with a collaborative, or the structure of such a collaborative?

Jonah: Both. Subcommittee 1 and 2 will figure out the research agenda. Subcommittee 3 is more focused on operations, governance, coordination, structure of what this would look like.

Kathy Kim: What's the difference between Subcommittee 1 and 2?

Jonah: Subcommittee 1 is more focused on technology itself, 2 is focused on quality measurement and use/management of the technology.

Ravi: Subcommittee 3 is a good subcommittee to look at issues pertaining to adoption and sustainability. Previous research in this area has included studies of the socio-technical model of technology adoption. May be of interest to social researchers.

Dave Minch: One important topic to consider is the challenge of structured vs. unstructured data/text. Trying to extract data from unstructured text is something that is very difficult.

Lisa Scott Lee, Sacramento: Sat on national committee standards, consortia, HL7. Wants to make sure that universal standards are adopted by the state. Recommend starting from the federal level of what recommended standards already exist and should be accepted, as opposed to reinventing the wheel and developing additional ones at the state level.

Cindy Watkins: Are we looking for learning centers that are already existing, or new ones? Who would be the home for this? Will this look like one or many centers?

Jonah: It will be important to figure out how to maximize participation, equity, fairness and transparency. We would like to avoid maelstrom of proposals to the federal government. Instead, would much rather support a collaborative that generates broad research participation in a harmonious fashion. The workgroup should develop and support this process.

Sam Bell: That was my question as well, how will this vision work out?   Would one center be chosen as being the home for this? Would there be a structure to support individual research grants under these centers, e.g. p27 grants?

Jonah: Open question, ideally trying to develop a way to have one application with many signatories representing many stakeholders, bearing a state-issued "imprimatur" to send to the federal government for consideration.

Sam: Every additional layer of coordination/organization can become an encumbrance that may thwart the goals of the consortium. It will be interesting to figure out the sweet spot. Another interesting point would be to try to leverage other activities that are going on, e.g. RHIOs, and build research on top of that.

Ravi: Agree, this is the right approach

Deborah Collingwood: Will the research agenda include questions about policies privacy and security regarding health information exchange? How do privacy laws interfere with data exchange?

Jonah: Cal-PSAB (Privacy Security Advisory Board) has been meeting regarding such questions.

Dave ?: Secondary use needs to be identified in the work that the PSAB is doing. De-identification is really a technical question.

Alex Kam: We'll monitor the research group of PSAB and see if there are any technical elements that may apply to this workgroup.

Jonah: Will PSAB address secondary use?

Alex Kam: I think so but we may need to adjust our timing.

Bill Spooner: Sustainability is the goal some years from now. Prior to achieving this, what about the idea of exploring sponsorship opportunities with industry, e.g. hi-tech companies?

Lisa Scott Lee, Sacramento County: Agree that this would be a great idea. She is part of a consortium of counties (30 of 33 counties); the "County Collaborative Coalition" that can serve as beta sites. Currently very expensive to share data.

???: What if there is no federal money that comes from our efforts? What will the state do? Will there still be a consortium? How can we look address sustainability regardless of federal funds? Also, who will be coordinating project management, deliverables, the big picture across subcommittees?

Jonah: Will need to go back to workgroups to answer the first question. Will need to get input in terms of the highest priority efforts that should be supported. The answer to the sustainability question should also include hi-tech companies, silicon valley, venture capital. We should get their voices in here as well. In terms of deliverables, project management, specifics will come out of subcommittee 3.

Ravi: Answers will come out of subcommittee discussions, gap analysis. Also figuring out potential funding streams outside federal government, industry may play a significant role here, and might be willing to fund cooperative research with entities that could serve as test beds, etc.

Kathy Kim: Comment. The usual course of developing a research agenda, involves taking what you have and fitting it to an RFP. In this case, there is no RFP, yet we are being asked to determine research directions. This is a challenge since we don't know what our funders will focus on. Should we spend some time figuring out what California can offer in terms of research? Also, would it make sense to collapse 1 and 2, since they both allude to the research agenda?

Jonah: Perhaps we should collapse 1 and 2, and add another subcommittee to inventory California's strengths and needs, to produce an inventory of assets.

Lynn: It may make sense to all come together in the beginning to figure this out.

Simon: There was some research done by Kaiser studying how to apply research to produce tangible benefits. In some cases the technical and quality components would be closely aligned, sometimes this may be more complex and worth looking at separately.

Action Items

Subcommittees 1 and 2 will be combined. A new subcommittee will be formed that will be tasked with inventorying California's research assets. The workgroup charter will be updated to reflect these changes.